

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35 are pending and stand rejected. In view of the following remarks, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103

Claims 11-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,253,193 issued to Ginter in view of USNP 6,105,027 issue to Schneider.

Claim 1 directed to a method for sharing data and recites the following acts:

1. receiving, from a user of a client, a request for data from a server;
2. obtaining access rights for the user; and
3. downloading to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights.

The Examiner asserts that Ginter teaches downloading access rights and data to a client but admits that Ginter fails to teach downloading an applet to a client where that applet is operable to customize a display of the downloaded data by the client according to the downloaded access rights. The Examiner attempts to remedy this deficiency citing Schneider. That attempt is flawed.

The Examiner asserts that Schneider, col. 27, lines 41-51 teach an applet that is downloaded to a client and operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to access rights also downloaded to the client. Specifically, the Examiner states

[T]he broadest and reasonable interpretations of claim limitations are made to meet the claim language and the claim limitation "the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights" is interpreted as the applet makes the display and generate a view specific to the customer based upon the user's resource access right in the following ways: Schneider teaches

when applet making the display, if the resource has a hyperlink, the hyperlink is included in the list; if it is a resource for which the user presently does not have access, but to which the user may request access, the list includes the name and email address of the administrator for the resource (Schneider: Column 27 Line 41 - 51).

The Examiner's reliance on Schneider is misplaced. A cursory review of the passage cited by the Examiner reveals that Schneider's applet does not customize a display. Schneider's applet simply requests, on behalf of a user, information from a proxy operating remotely from the applet. See Schneider, col. 27, lines 26-28. The proxy, not the applet, customizes or "filters" the requested information according to the user groups to which the user belongs and returns the filtered information to the applet. Schneider, col. 27, lines 32-41. The applet then uses the filtered information it received from the proxy to make a display. Schneider, col. 27, lines 41-42. In making the display, the applet applies any filters specified in the request made on behalf of the user. Schneider, col. 27, lines 42-44. In this manner, the display made by the applet using the information filtered by the remote proxy indicates the resources available to the user and an address to request those resources not available to the user. Schneider, col. 27, lines 44-51.

As made clear above, Claim 1 recites that the applet that is downloaded to the client with the access rights and the data is responsible for customizing a display of the data according to the access rights. Schneider's applet does not customize the display. Schneider's applet simply (1) makes a request for information, (2) receives the information in response to the request, and (3) makes a display using the received information and any filters specified in the request. Consequently, Schneider's applet is not operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights in the manner specified by Claim 1.

For at least this reason, Claim 1 is patentable over those references as are Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12, 22, 23, and 27 which depend from Claim 1.

Claim 13 is directed to a document management system and recited the following elements:

1. a server for providing data from a document stored in a folder, the

server operable to receive, from a user of a client, a request for the data;


2. an agent associated with said folder, the agent operable to obtain access rights for the user and to cause the server to download to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights.

Again, Ginter and Schneider fail to teach an agent that is operable to cause a server to download to the client the access rights, the data, and an applet where that applet is operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights. For at least this reason, Claim 13 is patentable over those references as are Claims 15, 16, 18, 29, 30, 34, and 35 which depend from Claim 13.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Garth F. Schmeling

By 
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

March 10, 2006